



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ties in our public school systems, both in the East and in the West. If boys need Greek for entrance, they will study it, and then those that are robust in their intellectual strength will continue it. But if they do not get the beginning, how will they be able to continue? Thus far, Amherst has not improved its opportunity. What the Trustees have given is almost a subterfuge. It will not prove of any permanent value for that 'renaissance' of which Professor D'Ooge speaks. It is to be hoped that they will soon realize that an opportunity granted to almost no other college in this land should be improved with a most farseeing and conscientious thoroughness.

G. L.

RESEARCH AND THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

I

The amount and the value of America's output in the field of original research in the ancient and the modern languages are frequently discussed, and variously judged even within the profession. At one end of the scale we have the estimate of certain critics who maintain that, if annotated texts of an elementary character, book-reviews, articles duplicating work done ages ago, with which the writer has been too lazy to acquaint himself, and mechanical compilations which indicate little more than trained industry, but were composed by their author to pad a bibliography, and justify his scholastic existence to the unenlightened, are left out of calculation, the residuum is small. These friends of scholarship sometimes go so far as to declare that the importance of original investigations in language and literature is ludicrously overrated, any way; that there is an unpardonable amount of time misspent in German universities and even in our own in the search for facts that, when ascertained, are of no moment to human life or happiness. But for such enunciations as these it is easy to find a corrective. The rapidly increasing productivity of American scholars evidences a wide prevalence of contrary ideas, and for the high quality of their work plenty of testimony exists in the writings of impartial foreigners. I have heard at least one widely experienced scholar, whose criticisms were notably conservative and judicial, prophesy that the primacy of Germany in classical philology was destined to pass to the United States at no distant future.

Much more commonly met with than the critic who disparages original investigations in this field is the man who considers such activity as the primary function of a university professorship. Fresh perhaps from study or a visit in Germany, where

limited hours of teaching and a generally protected life of a somewhat monastic nature are still possible to the professor, he is quick to inveigh against what he finds in his native land. As he describes the situation with rebellious fervor, all our university faculties number, especially among the abler assistant professors, those who, though burdened with twice or thrice the teaching hours of their brethren across the sea, yet perform in addition much clerical labor that a ten-dollar-a-week clerk could do sufficiently well, and too often on top of this do the administrative work of officials in a department store, a state prison and a home for the feeble minded. He will, furthermore, cite the cases of busy men in every institution, who are sent from time to time on advertising tours among actual or potential contributors to the college funds, or in trying to impress upon legislators educational needs which the duties of their position should lead them to discover for themselves. Other professors, in that dreaded mid-career, when household expenses are heaviest and the family purse the lightest, are compelled to deviate from the paths of science into those of finance, searching for supplementary dollars in enervating summer school courses, picture-shows to the *polloi*, or by publishing in a surcharged market 'the first pedagogically perfect' Vergil or composition-book. Under the pressure of these occupations, so our critic declares, the enthusiasm for original investigation must inevitably atrophy, and, when such an overworked man does steal an hour from the professorial day, he spends it in a walk over the city pavements in quest of health, or perhaps in furthering a slight acquaintance which he still maintains with his wife and children. If the study and research that are involved in the preparation of graduate courses result in one tiny opusculum each year, the author is quite content with the number of his intellectual offspring, and at each birth plays the part of a proud father, registering the name and date in the bibliographical records of a journal of philology.

Now, it is needless to say that the man who draws such lugubrious pictures of academic life is usually one who has a passion for scholarly research, a distaste for undergraduate teaching and a profound conviction that he is being cheated out of the quickest way to fame. You cannot cheer his despondency by telling him that the sort of service that the university demands of him and of many others is probably more useful than the rôle which he covets, and any suggestion that those who father and finance college teachers may after all be doing the best they can under adverse circumstances he hails as the sentiments of one who is blind to the cause, if not a traitor. The only

way to content such a man, to whose strictures in varying degrees of severity we all have had to listen, is to create for him a chair of research, and allow him his full Teutonic usefulness. The part which he is fitted to play in graduate instruction is most important, of course, and is later to engage our attention. The point for us now to bear in mind is that his complaints as well as the cynical disparagements of the scoffer are alike indications of the situation that really exists in America, whether we rejoice or sorrow over it; research certainly cannot be described as the main function, nor even a very important function of the vast majority of our professorial positions, as actually conceived and constituted today. The classical scholar, at any rate, receives and for a long time to come in America is likely to receive very little encouragement to consider original contributions more than a by-product of his activities. Work in research all university teachers must do, but almost wholly to keep abreast of their specialties, and to give adequate training to the students that will later themselves take the higher positions in the profession, and contribute their share to the scholarly output under more favorable circumstances, let us hope, than this generation enjoys. Nobody, therefore, should be surprised, when he perceives from his reading of the philological journals that though there are hundreds of men equipt by natural capacity and lengthy training to conduct scholarly investigations of the most exacting sort, almost none of our teachers below the college grade, and no large proportion even of college teachers is privileged to publish books or articles that are important in both quality and number, and the percentage of doctors of philosophy who follow their thesis by other creative achievement grows smaller, it would seem, as their number increases. This in itself would point to something faulty in our graduate instruction.

In point of fact, the chief requirement made of university teachers is that they shall teach. Where one or more members of a department neglect their teaching, or do it uninspiringly and perfunctorily, the department stagnates, or disintegrates, and the fame that the instructors may win for themselves in the outside world, though it sometimes secures merited commendation and reward from a dazzled board of trustees, may yet not save them from the criticism of students who came to them for something else. Evidences of maladjustment of this sort may be discerned in every university, although the neglectful but productive professor is himself the last to be conscious of it. The remedy, as we have already indicated, is to put such a man in a chair of research, and, if necessary, import into

his department pedagogical strength from outside. Universities as well as individuals may come deleteriously under the spell of a foreign land. If it may be truly stated that in all grades of our educational system the demand is primarily for teachers who unite a reasonable amount of scholarship with culture and pedagogical skill, with the emphasis all on the last, the same cannot be said of Germany, so far as the writer can judge by his own experience and that of many whose education in German universities has left them with the same conviction. There is no such insistence there on pedagogical efficiency. Nowhere, indeed, is it more fully apparent to an American student that learned specialization and productivity in research do not necessarily make an even tolerably competent teacher. German boys listen respectfully to lectures which would convert one of our classrooms into a dormitory or, if often repeated, would cause among our youths of livelier spirit and laxer discipline a riotous rebellion. With one or two notable exceptions, the lectures that I attended at the University of Berlin would have been pedagogically as valuable and quite as inspiring if presented in book-form, or if heard from the horn of a phonograph. In the United States, on the other hand, literary form and persuasive delivery are the ambition of every college teacher, and the art of teaching is reckoned as admirable as it is difficult. No, the United States is not Germany, however lamentable that may be, and, precisely because our graduate schools are so much patterned after the German university, we may look for the misfits that I am mentioning.

II

Let us next examine conditions among the students themselves, and scrutinize the instruction which graduate schools advertise to meet American needs, comparing their avowed purposes with their actual accomplishments. The range of subjects is extensive. We may begin by mentioning those courses which, bearing the name Proseminary and Seminary, are designed to train students in the methods of original research, to practise them in the principles of textual criticism and to acquaint them with a certain amount of bibliography. These commonly constitute the backbone of the curriculum. Secondly, there are various courses in special subjects, such as syntax, palaeography, history and archaeology, and, thirdly, numerous reading-courses which have more difficult requirements than those which are given with purely cultural intent to undergraduates. A year of high grade work is normally enough to gain the degree of master of arts, but for the doctorate a triennium of study is the rule, at the end of which time the candidate presents a thesis that embodies original research, and,

if this be accepted, appears for written and oral examinations to test his scholastic maturity.

The degree of doctor of philosophy, as conferred by American universities, has been under fire for years. Some of the criticism is based on half knowledge, and is offensively offered. This sort not infrequently comes from men who have entered the graduate school without the will-power to submit themselves to severe mental discipline of any kind. They regard the more technical and exacting training of all graduate instruction as an irksome and mentally prostrating grind, and, with what they call 'superior cultural interests', they single out for special scorn such work as textual criticism, the minutiae of syntax, which involve close reasoning in their treatment, the verifying of references, which cultivates care, and even scrupulously exact translation, which is of the very essence of literary study, all as mere pettinesses; that is to say, they assail precisely those things that could alone save them from inert dilettantism. At the end of a year they leave the graduate school, hopeless failures, so far as a scholarly career is concerned, but admirably qualified by illwill born of personal disappointment to become its dangerous foes. A critic almost as trying is the ex-teacher who has won a little authority from success in some other career, but still wishes to voice his sentiments on pedagogical problems. There is for us little cheer in the fact that we may be able to recall to mind, though we politely forbear to state, the reasons that relieved our ranks of a colleague who could not practise what he later preached so well.

Now while it may be courageously affirmed that more fools have written about the Ph.D. than have ever taken it, and while many of the spoken and written censures not only of the degree but of all graduate instruction are so full of fallacies and absurdities that we make merry over them, and lose our justifiable wrath in a laugh, yet it is undeniable that not a few criticisms have been as just and helpful as they have been temperate and of kindly purpose. It would be a disheartening and unprofitable task to attempt to review here all the weaknesses and imbecillities that friend and foe have attributed to our present system, but some forms which the criticisms take need mention.

The doctor's thesis itself proves to be the easiest target for shafts of ridicule. Its very purpose is usually misconceived by the layman. It should, of course, primarily be regarded as nothing more than a proof that the candidate knows how to gather accurately the passages on which he bases his investigation, digest them logically and draw from them conclusions which are scientifically sound. Naturally, therefore, as time goes on, the thesis will

with increasing rarity be of a sort to charm the general reading public, or even to rob the censors of our highest degree of their opportunities for gibes. It is evidently quite beside the mark to assail the choice of subject, because it is concerned with the harness of a horse, or the insignificances of a religious cult. We cannot look for a day when a tiro, who has had only three or four year's training in the methods of research, will produce in our thoroughly worked field of the classical languages a doctor's thesis that is epoch-making or of much vital importance to humanity, or of very broad range.

But the personality of our young doctor: of philosophy also comes in for criticism, nor can we deny that it will always be easy under our present system to pick from them misfits that will excellently point a critic's moral. In the first place, both Germany and the United States indisputably contain men who have won the doctorate of philosophy by what is hardly more than a course of persistent plodding, and a faint flash of originality that is detected in their thesis, a hapax phenomenon of their entire lives. Such, however, are few, and generally die an early but timely scholastic death. But unfortunately there are also others, rather more numerous, who, possessing a natural aptitude for thinking in millimeters, find in the minutiae of their doctoral training life's great attraction, and commence a long career of closet-study, which is interrupted only by the demands of such physical functions as eating and sleeping, and totally unfits them to inspire the American boy with anything but disgust. Their thesis, though from the human point of view it may lack all significance, yet receives a recognition for its scholarly adequacy which tempts them into a long career of compulsory over-exertion. And so they continue to grind out exhaustive and exhausting papers, which deaden the pages of our philological journals, and threaten our philological meetings with syncope. The attacks, then, should not be directed against the character of the thesis itself, but rather against the influence that its preparation has on a certain type of student, or against a system that includes it as part of the work of certain men and women who could have been more profitably engaged in a different curriculum.

I would now in all diffidence call attention to a situation existing in our graduate schools, which it seems to me demands correction, if we are to preserve the meaning and protect the value of our highest degree, the doctorate of philosophy, and yet at the same time do justice to the needs of the great majority of the students in attendance. This situation deserves our serious consideration all the more, because it is, I believe, precisely the

ultimate cause of the more weighty attacks that have been made upon the Ph.D. itself and the men that win it. Though I shall speak of the higher instruction in Greek and Latin alone, I suspect that what I have to say is equally true of that given in other languages and in history, and at least partially true of the work in some of the sciences. Although the main problems have interested me ever since my own student days, yet I should hardly have ventured to consider them in a formal paper, had not discussion of them with professors of wider experience than my own (my teaching has been limited to Harvard, Radcliffe and Pennsylvania) and with many graduate students convinced me that something might profitably be said. So far as the latter source of information is concerned, the equipment, purposes and opinions of just our Pennsylvania students alone would probably afford me a fair criterion; for the number of men and women possessed of a respectable A.B. that take our graduate Latin courses amounts to from thirty-five to forty a year, and they represent every college in the United States that offers graduate instruction. From a study of their cases I can only conclude that the system which Pennsylvania's sister institutions have adopted for their higher training in the Classics exhibits the same imperfections and inadequacies as her own, and even worse, where the departments of Greek and Latin have a smaller faculty, and so can provide only a minimum number of courses. Not only do the statements of teachers and students prove this, but also my examination of doctoral dissertations and numerous college catalogues.

Now, any layman who had not specialized in the mysteries of college catalogues, and thereby learned caution, after reading their descriptions of the graduate courses offered, and noting that the Ph.D., although a certificate of ability in research, is normally the only degree that universities give for lengthy and serious graduate work in the Classics, might easily imagine that the many students who are finding these letters professionally, I almost said, commercially, so valuable that they willingly give years of costly effort to add them to their names, are genuinely and permanently interested in research. Would it be possible to go further astray? Training in research is, indeed, the backbone of all our graduate instruction, and at present receives sufficient emphasis to inhibit any desire of entering the school on the part of many whose interest are chiefly cultural, aesthetic or literary, or in fact of almost anybody, except such as have in view a pedagogical career. But even these prospective teachers rarely have any real devotion for productive scholarship. The vast majority of them are to hold positions in High

Schools or small Colleges, where long hours and much routine work will stifle any ambition in that line. Nor can we be surprised that with a positive distaste for the technical training of a scholar, many even of our more brilliant college seniors refuse to enter our graduate schools at all, or, if they do matriculate for a higher degree, soon resign their ambition in disgust. The unfortunate thing is that our graduate schools, recognizing this perfectly natural and inculpable division of interests and needs among its students, instead of meeting the situation in a straightforward and rational manner, resort to compromise. But it is as difficult to kill two birds with one stone in education as it is in fowling, and, as a result of making the curriculum neither one thing nor the other, a once honored degree is receiving vital injury, and, even in spite of this sacrifice, the schools are failing to give the bulk of the students the education that they should expect, and, to judge by their frequent complaints, that they do expect. The logical solution of the difficulty would be to separate the radically different sets of students, leaving them only a portion of their present work in common. Then assign to those who look forward to only the more elementary teaching of High School or College courses appropriate in contents and method, and to the man who is interested primarily in research and a career of scholarly productivity certain other courses, but, along with them and of more importance, a private training under the personal guidance of the department's best scholars. This last man will then have an honest doctorate of philosophy as his goal, and be infinitely more likely to live up to its real meaning in after life. Of course, the other curriculum too must have its certificate of completion. For this we must either use one of the old degrees in a new meaning, or invent one even at the risk of using for a name-appendix what little remains as yet unappropriated from our alphabet, and of being charged with introducing a thirty-third degree into the fraternity of scholarship. The present writer would incline to make of the student who has chosen the less technical curriculum in any of the languages a doctor of letters.

At this point I am tempted to follow the example set by so many writers on educational topics, who describe an evil state of affairs, and then with some meticulous but felicitous phrase, like 'the limits of this article forbid', or 'I shall postpone until another occasion', or 'it is not my purpose to enter into the practical phases of these problems', withdraw from the scene to let others provide the remedy, if they can. The unfortunate thing is that remedies require some brains and often some cour-

age to formulate, especially if the writer has to be specific and not vague and general in his suggestions. It is, therefore, with no great confidence in my powers that I come to the more practical portion of my paper and venture constructive proposals.

III

At the outset the danger of drawing the lines between students too narrowly is apparent. Some of the more severely disciplinary courses are indispensable to every matriculate, no matter how slight a strain his subsequent career as a teacher will put upon his intellect. Students come to us now with so little method and system in their manner of studying, such loose ways of thinking and of expressing themselves, and in general such inaccuracy in the performance of written or oral work of any sort that we have a lively consciousness that we are laboring with the youth of our own land, America the Hasty. During the first year, therefore, the candidates for the two degrees would choose chiefly from the same courses, and preferably those that would be most corrective of unscholarly habits. The student whose goal was the literary degree would elect a certain amount of the more technical or narrowly scientific work, for instance, a proseminary course, which would give him a slight but intelligent knowledge of textual criticism and hermeneutics, and also perhaps a course which treated somewhat summarily the morphology and syntax of the languages. In some Universities a sketch of the whole field of classical philology in the wider sense of the term is offered under some such title as *The History and Problems of Classical Philology*. This would provide either class of students with an initial bibliography, and an elementary survey of their subject, and in the case of certain special branches, such as archaeology, geography, palaeography and epigraphy, all the class room knowledge and all the guidance in his private reading that the literary candidate would need. General courses in the history of Greece and Rome, in the private life of the ancient peoples, in the history of their literatures belong in the same category. Untechnical surveys of mythology and religion, or of ancient art would be appropriate for the initial year. On the other hand, the minute study of portions of Greek and Latin writers, chiefly from the textual point of view, such as is pursued in the higher seminary course, belongs to a later period, and rather to the curriculum of the future professional scholar. For him also should be the heavier courses in comparative grammar and comparative linguistics, those in the Greek and the Italian dialects, in the Latinity of different ages and varieties (early, mediaeval, Christian, colloquial, etc.), in Sanskrit, and perhaps in modern Greek;

furthermore, courses in metrics, epigraphy, palaeography, topographical studies based on Pausanias, archaeological specialties like numismatics, vase painting, monumental remains of Etruscan civilization, and any course that dealt with details of topography; then, too, to speak generally, those research courses in history, politics, philosophy or ethics which are based entirely on a study of the primary sources; probably also any specialized work in Roman or Greek law, or constitutional antiquities, in the geography of classic lands, and, finally, all intensive study in the field of religion, such as that of the cults of special deities, the Greek mysteries, Roman festivals, and perhaps even comparative religion, unless the treatment should be of a very general sort. On the other hand, in the preparation for the literary degree much more stress should be laid on instruction in literature from the comparative point of view. Every worthy curriculum for the doctorate of philosophy even now requires proof of a certain minimum but considerable amount of reading in the Greek and the Latin writers, but this demand should be made much heavier in the case of the candidate for the literary degree. In compensation less intensive study of special authors should be required of him. Courses that cover all of Homer, Aristophanes, Euripides, Vergil and Horace, if taught by the right man, could be made a lasting inspiration. In literary history, special topics of wide range might be pursued, such as the Greek dramatists, the history of Greek and Latin fiction, pastoral poetry, ancient and modern, a study of poetics associated with extensive reading in lyric poetry in both languages, a history of ancient literary criticism. There would be a place too in this curriculum for such courses as the following: *A History of the Drama from the Earliest Times to the Present* (the lectures to be given by members of different departments so as to cover the drama of England, France, Spain, Italy, and Germany as well as of Greece and Rome), *The History of Classical Culture in the Middle Ages*, *The Classics in the Renaissance*, *An Historical Account of Translations of the Chief Greek and Latin Authors, with Lectures on the Art of Translation*, *The Classical Element in Modern Literatures*, *The Use of Greek and Roman Myths in English Poetry*, *The After-Life of Vergil with a History of the Interpretation of Vergil's Aeneid*, *The Relation of Ancient Art to Modern Art and Literature*. Free from the shackles of a 'major and minor system', the candidate for the Litt.D. could elect supplementary courses in various other departments than the classical, and their representatives would be present at his final oral examination for the degree. Latin composition is a subject that should figure large in his preparation, and

ready translation of Greek and Latin of all periods should be expected of him. The subjects assigned for written papers should be of a character to lead the writer to take broad and comparative points of view, and not serve as exercises in the exhaustive handling of small problems, with the hope of discovering something new, no matter how microscopic. The final thesis for the Litt.D. would be simply something more ambitious of the same sort, a proof of catholic taste, wide knowledge of literatures and skill in literary expression. Finally it need hardly be said that neither class of student would necessarily be excluded from taking any of the classical courses for which he might be fitted, but it should be understood that certain courses were conducted with sharply defined ends in view, and the present confusion which leads to the seating of men with irreconcilable needs and ambitions side by side in the same lecture-room should be avoided.

If the educational system of our graduate schools could be reconstructed in somewhat the way that has been outlined to meet the real needs and demands of our advanced students, both degrees would be trustworthy labels. The Litt.D. would indicate the completion of a curriculum intended to give a literary training which would be the best possible not only for most of our future teachers, but also for prospective journalists, authors and the like. The Ph.D. would signify that its possessor had been specifically trained for a career of scholarship that should have a university professorship as its ultimate goal. Of course, as time went on, the fact would be better recognized than it is today that only a few institutions have the material and professorial equipment that fits them to give a degree in research, but that even the least of our graduate schools could give proper preparation for an equally honorable and difficult degree in literature. Moreover, we should not only attract more students to our universities, but those that came to us, having quickly discovered their natural aptitudes, and realizing, that no matter which line they took, they would receive proper cultivation and a just reward, would constitute a more stable and enthusiastic membership for our graduate schools than these now secure. Men whose unfitness for a Ph.D. was apparent from the start, as it generally is, could be gently dissuaded from an attempt that would inevitably end in disappointment, and in many cases they could properly be diverted into the other line of work. Fewer men will then be performing a labor of hate. The faculty itself would benefit. While the Ph.D., if historically and rightly conceived, is a specialist's degree, and the work for it should be concentrated in one department, the training for the Litt.D., as we have sug-

gested, would fall to the duties of several. The result might well be a more harmonious and appreciative collaboration among professors, and would undoubtedly be a broadening and quickening of the individual teacher's mind; for he would be compelled to give his instruction with reference to the needs not only of the specialist in his own subject, but of many other students whose interests were of the comparative sort. This would demolish some absurd and unnatural barriers that curse our Universities today. Furthermore, both the more literary professor and he whose interests are chiefly in productive research could count on a juster recognition of their respective fitnesses and usefulness. Our graduate students would receive effective training, the minority for university-chairs of the two somewhat overlapping sorts, the majority for teaching-positions in our High Schools and smaller Colleges.

But, after all, the writer of an article like this must not be too optimistic. He fully realizes that graduate schools cannot guarantee the production of either a great teacher or a great scholar, much less that combination of the two, who, possessed of superior powers of imagination, exuberant vitality, a genuine love of literature, and, best of all, the God-given gift of personal magnetism will prove a success in spite of a defective education.

WALTON BROOKS McDANIEL.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF PITTSBURGH AND VICINITY

The Classical Association of Pittsburgh and Vicinity held its third meeting of the year at Shadyside Academy, January 20. Dr. W. R. Crabbe, Principal of the Shadyside Academy, gave an interesting talk on the recent meetings of The American Philological Association and The Archaeological Institute, held in Pittsburgh, December 27-29 last. Professor S. G. Oliphant, of Grove City College, read a paper on the Legend of the Strix, which gave a clear and convincing account of that fanciful being, and showed how this bit of superstition has survived in modern times. Dr. L. W. Burdick, of the University of Pittsburgh, read a paper entitled The Educational Value of the Classics from the Psychological Standpoint. After an outline of the history of Latin as a school subject, he showed the great value of Latin and Greek for gaining a mastery of English, power of concentration and good habits of study, etc.—all matters to which the psychologist cannot take exception. The paper was especially reassuring to those whose classical faith may have begun to waver.

B. L. ULLMAN, President.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.